OPEN MEETING AGENDA ITEM



Hugh L. Hallman RECEIVED Hallman & Affiliates, P.C. 2 2011 North Campo Alegre Road **ORIGINAL** 2013 NOV 12 A 9: 46 Suite 100 3 Tempe, AZ 85281 CORP COMMISSION 480-424-3900 4 DOCKET CONTROL Bar No. 12164 5 Attorney for The Alliance for Solar Choice 6 BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION Arizona Corporation Commission 7 DOCKETED Bob Stump, Chairman 8 Gary Pierce, Commissioner Brenda Burns, Commissioner NOV 1 2 2013 9 Bob Burns, Commissioner DOCKETED BY Susan Bitter Smith, Commissioner 10 11 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION Docket No. E-01345A-13-0248 OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE 12 COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF NET METERING COST SHIFT SOLUTION. 13 14 MOTION TO TERMINATE LFCR & 15 ORDER AN IMMEDIATE GENERAL RATE CASE 16 The Alliance for Solar Choice ("TASC") moves the Arizona Corporation Commission 17 ("Commission") to: (1) suspend or terminate the lost fixed cost recover ("LFCR") mechanism 18 that was adopted in the recently-concluded Arizona Public Service Company ("APS") general 19 rate case ("GRC"); and (2) require APS immediately to file a GRC, which may focus on the 20 21 residential rate design that fundamentally is at issue in the APS Application. This is the only 22 legal means to impose a new rate, charge or classification on residential solar customers prior to 23 2016. 24 THE COMMISSION SHOULD SUSPEND THE LFCR 25 AND ORDER APS TO FILE A NEW RATE CASE. 26 In an October 17, 2013, letter to the docket, Commissioner Pierce expressed concern that the 27 Commission not have to wait until 2015 to grant APS's request for a new rate, charge or

28

classification on residential solar customers. The October 17, 2013 letter states:

"If the Commission were to conclude that Net Metering results in a cost shift, the question becomes how and when the Commission should offer a policy solution that addresses it. The fact is that APS will not be filing a rate case until 2015, with new rates going into effect no sooner than July 2016."

APS entered a settlement in its recently concluded GRC, the terms of which purports to prevent APS from filing a rate case before May 31, 2015. However, the settlement agreement and Commission order concluding the GRC establishes conditions under which the moratorium on a new GRC can be lifted. Section 9.11 of the Settlement Agreement incorporated in Decision No. 73183 (May 24, 2012) states:

"If the Commission decides to suspend, terminate, or materially modify the LFCR mechanism prior to the Company's next general rate case, and does not provide alternative relief that adequately addresses fixed cost revenue erosion, the moratorium for filing general rate case application shall terminate."

This same language also appears in the Order itself in Section IX, page 14, bullet point two.

APS, Commission Staff and the Residential Utility Consumers Office ("RUCO") all supported the design of the LFCR as parties to the recent APS GRC. However, APS, Staff and RUCO now propose to materially modify the LFCR to impose new charges on residential solar customers. *See* Recommended Order, Oct. 1, 2013, p. 14, ll. 14-16; RUCO Comments on Staff's Memorandum and Proposed Order, p. 1, Oct. 30, 2013; APS Comments on Staff Report and Recommended Order, p. 14, ll. 8-26. However, use of the LCFR does not negate Arizona's constitutional restrictions on single-issue ratemaking.

RUCO's November 8, 2013, filing acknowledges it proposes a new charge outside a GRC: "RUCO introduces a charge (without waiting for a rate case) that will rationalize the market to compliance levels." RUCO's statement is troubling for two reasons. First, it admits to inappropriate single-issue ratemaking outside a GRC. Second, RUCO acknowledges that it has

26

27

28

engineered proposed charges to control residential solar market activity. No part of the Arizona Constitution allows the Commission to use rate design to "rationalize" the solar market, and RUCO's use of the LFCR does not insulate the Commission from constitutional requirements for determining just and reasonable rates.

A clear majority of parties in this proceeding recognize that Arizona law requires a GRC to establish rates, charges and classifications. See, e.g., The Arizona Competitive Power Alliance, p. 1, ll. 23-25, Nov. 4, 2013 ("The long term solution will be for the ACC to establish retail electric rates that reflect the true portion of fixed and variable costs associated with serving each customer. Unfortunately, this type of rate design change can only be accomplished in the context of a full rate case."); Solar Energy Industries Association, p. 2, ll. 5-8, Nov. 4, 2013 ("SEIA agrees with Staff that deferral of a final determination of these issues to APS's next general rate case is the appropriate (and, SEIA has argued, legally required) outcome of this proceeding."); Western Resource Advocates, p. 2, Nov. 6, 2013 ("We conclude that... any changes in rate design should be considered only in a rate case where better data would be available."); Arizona Solar Energy Industries Assoc., p. 1, ll. 25-27, No. 4, 2013 ("AriSEIA is in agreement with Commission Staff that a true examination of this issue can only fairly and comprehensively be undertaken in a general rate case..."); SouthWestern Power Group II, LLC, p.3, Nov. 4, 2013 ("We appreciate that it is procedurally difficult to fix rate design outside of a rate case."); Interstate Renewable Energy Council, Inc., p. 2, Oct. 10, 2013 ("IREC agrees with Staff that the Commission should hold workshops to develop an agreed-upon methodology for the valuation of DG in advance of APS's next rate case."); Arizona Solar Deployment Alliance, p. 3, Il. 8-9, Nov. 4, 2013 ("For these reasons, ASDA supports Staff's initial recommendation of waiting to decide the NEM issue in the next APS rate case.")

The Commission should observe its constitutional requirements for rate setting and not inappropriately approve a rate, charge or classification outside a GRC. Use of the LFCR does not absolve the Commission of its responsibilities. However, that does not mean that the Commission is without power to act before 2015. Although the terms of APS's recently concluded GRC restrict, in most circumstances, APS from entering a new GRC before 2015, the terms do allow the Commission to suspend or terminate the LFCR mechanism, lift the moratorium on a new GRC before 2015, and order a new GRC to develop solutions to address, with respect to residential rate design, the APS fixed cost revenue erosion, among other matters.

WHEREFORE, TASC moves that the Commission immediately suspend or terminate the LFCR and order APS to file a new general rate case application with the Commission.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 12th day of November, 2013.

By

Hugh L. Hallman

Hallman & Affiliates, P.C.

2011 North Campo Alegre Road

Suite 100

Tempe, AZ 85281

480-424-3900

Bar No. 12164

Attorney for The Alliance for Solar Choice

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify I have this day sent via hand delivery an original and thirteen copies of the foregoing **TASK MOTION TO TERMINATE LFCR** on this 12th day of November, 2013 with:

Docket Control

Arizona Corporation Commission

1200 W. Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing documents via regular mail on all parties of record and all persons listed on the official service list for Docket No. E-01345A-13-0248 on the Arizona Corporation Commission's website:

Arizona Corporation	Janice Alward	1200 W. Washington St.
Commission		Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Arizona Corporation	Steve Olea	1200 W. Washington St.
Commission		Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Arizona Corporation	Lyn Farmer	1200 W. Washington St.
Commission		Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Pinnacle West Capital	Thomas Loquvam	400 N. 5th St, MS 8695
Corporation		Phoenix, Arizona 85004
	Lewis Levenson	1308 E. Cedar Lane
		Payson, Arizona 85541
	Patty Ihle	304 E. Cedar Mill Rd.
		Star Valley, Arizona 85541
TEP, Co. and UNS Electric,	Michael Patten	Roshka, DeWulf & Patten, PLC
Inc.	Jason Gellman	400 E. Van Buren St., Ste. 800
		Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Arizona Competitive Power	Greg Patterson	Munger Chadwick
Alliance; Water Utility		916 W. Adams St. Ste. 3
Association of Arizona		Phoenix, Arizona 85007
RUCO	Daniel Pozefsky	1110 West Washington Street
		Suite 220
		Phoenix, Arizona 85007
TEP Co.	Bradley Carroll	88 E. Broadway Blvd.
	Kimberly A. Ruht	MS HQE910
		P.O. Box 711
		Tucson, Arizona 85702
Arizona Solar Deployment	Garry Hays	1702 E. Highland Ave., Suite 204
Alliance		Phoenix, Arizona 85016

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	-
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	-
2	4	
2	5	
2	6	

28

John Wallage	2210 Sandh Briant Dr
John Wallace	2210 South Priest Dr.
CT: 1: 11	Tempe, Arizona 85282
Tim Lindi	Keyes, Fox & Wiedman LLP
	436 14 th St., Suite 1305
	Oakland, CA 94612
Kevin T. Fox	Keyes, Fox & Wiedman LLP
	436 14 th St., Suite 1305
	Oakland, CA 94612
Anne Smart	45 Fremont Street, 32 nd Floor
	San Francisco, California 94105
Todd Glass	Wilson Sonsini Goodrich &
	Rosati, PC
	701 Fifth Ave., Suite 5100
	Seattle, Washington 98104
Court S. Rich	Rose Law Group
	6613 N. Scottsdale Rd., Ste. 200
	Scottsdale, Arizona 85250
Giancarlo Estrada	1 E. Camelback Rd., Suite 550
Estrada Legal, P.C.	Phoenix, AZ 85012
Erica M. Schroeder	Keyes, Fox & Wiedman LLP
	436 14 th St., Suite 1305
	Oakland, CA 94612
Timothy M. Hogan	202 E. McDowell Rd., Suite 153
	Phoenix, AZ 85004
David Berry	P.O. Box 1064
	Scottsdale, AZ 85252-1064
Mark Holohan	2221 W. Lone Cactus Dr., Suite 2
	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
W.R. Hansen	13815 W. Camino del Sol
	Sun City West, Arizona 85375
	Todd Glass Court S. Rich Giancarlo Estrada Estrada Legal, P.C. Erica M. Schroeder Timothy M. Hogan David Berry Mark Holohan

Dated this 12th day of November, 2013.

By

Hugh L. Hallman

Hallman & Affiliates, P.C.

2011 North Campo Alegre Road

Suite 100

Tempe, AZ 85281

480-424-3900

Bar No. 12164

Attorney for The Alliance for Solar Choice